



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,869	07/06/2005	Francis Plat	PC4-32818A	6691
1095	7590	06/30/2009	EXAMINER	
NOVARTIS			CHONG, YONG SOO	
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3				
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080			1617	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/30/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/537,869	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PLAT ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Yong S. Chong	<b>Art Unit</b> 1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 5,6 and 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4,7 and 8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/166/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/12/05

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Status of the Application***

This Office Action is in response to applicant's remarks filed on 5/7/09. Claim(s) 1-9 are pending. Claim(s) 5-6, 9 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant's election **without traverse** of the restriction requirement in the reply is acknowledged. The requirement is deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL. Claim(s) 1-4, 7-8 are examined herein insofar as they read on the elected invention and species.

***Claim Objections***

Claim(s) 1-4, 7-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: Please correct "5-methyl-2-(2'-chloro-6'fluororanilino)phenylacetic acid" to "5-methyl-2-(2'-chloro-6'fluoroanilino)phenylacetic acid". Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 1 recites the broad recitation, a compound of formula V, and the claim also recites 5-methyl-2-(2'-chloro-6'fluororanilino)phenylacetic acid, which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham vs John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim(s) 1-4, 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Delgado et al. (US Patent 6,323,226 B1) in view of Fujimoto et al. (US Patent 6,291,523 B1).

The instant claims are directed to a pharmaceutical composition comprising valsartan and a COX-2 inhibitor of formula V.

Delgado et al. teach a method of treating congestive heart failure in a mammalian patient by administering a composition comprising a COX-2 inhibitor, such as rofecoxib, in combination with an angiotensin II receptor antagonist, such as valsartan (claims 1-3, 8). Pharmaceutically acceptable carriers are also taught (col. 4, lines 55-59).

Examiner notes that packages or kits containing separate containers of each active agent is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because these types of formulations are well known in the art and prevalent throughout the pharmaceutical industry.

Delgrado et al. teach as discussed above, however fail to specifically disclose the COX-2 inhibitor, 5-ethyl-2-(2',3',5',6'-tetrafluoroanilino)phenylacetic acid.

Fujimoto et al. teach that 5-ethyl-2-(2',3',5',6'-tetrafluoroanilino)phenylacetic acid is a well known COX-2 inhibitor (claims 17 and 25).

It is noted that the limitation regarding IC50 is an inherent property of the specific COX-2 inhibitor. "Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutual exclusive properties." Any properties exhibited by or benefits from are not given any patentable weight over the prior art provided the composition is inherent. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the disclosed properties are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See MPEP 2112.01. The burden is shifted to the applicant to show that the prior art product does not inherently possess the same properties as the instantly claimed product.

It is respectfully pointed out that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish from each other. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Thus, the intended use of a composition claim will be given no patentable weight.

It is further respectfully pointed out that a preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for

completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). See MPEP 2111.02.

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed invention was made, to have substituted the COX-2 inhibitor, 5-ethyl-2-(2',3',5',6'-tetrafluoroanilino)phenylacetic acid, as taught by Fujimoto et al. for the COX-2 inhibitor, rofecoxib, in the method of treating congestive heart failure as taught by Delgado et al.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to substitute the COX-2 inhibitor, 5-ethyl-2-(2',3',5',6'-tetrafluoroanilino)phenylacetic acid, as taught by Fujimoto et al. for the COX-2 inhibitor, rofecoxib, in the method of treating congestive heart failure as taught by Delgado et al. because of the functional equivalence between 5-ethyl-2-(2',3',5',6'-tetrafluoroanilino)phenylacetic acid and rofecoxib in inhibiting COX-2. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in treating congestive heart failure by administering a composition comprising 5-ethyl-2-(2',3',5',6'-tetrafluoroanilino)phenylacetic acid and valsartan.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong S. Chong whose telephone number is (571)-272-8513. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SREENI PADMANABHAN can be reached on (571)-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Yong S. Chong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1617

YSC